

**REMARKS****Status of the Claims**

In the December 28, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-4, 8-17, 19, 20 and 22 were pending in the Application. However, claims 1-22 were pending, of which claims 5-7, 18 and 21 were withdrawn. Claims 1, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 have been amended herein; no claims have been cancelled or added and no new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-22 are pending, claims 5-7, 18 and 21 are withdrawn. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 8-17, 19, 20 and 22 is respectfully requested..

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) on April 2, 2008. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner return a copy of Form PTO-1449 accompanying the IDS signed and initialed in the next communication to indicate that the references listed therein have been considered.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

On page 2, item 3, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 19, 20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Biederman (U.S. 7,069,392).

On page 3, item 5, the Office Action rejected claims 2, 3, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biederman in view of Kilkki (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0264377 A1). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites "an image processing unit that includes an image compression circuit for compressing image signals outputted from the computers" (lines 5-6) and "a circuit that bypasses keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed" (lines 9-11). Accordingly, the switching device recited in claim 1, provides a benefit of greater efficiency compared to the prior art by compressing image signals, but not the signals used for controlling a keyboard or a mouse.

In contrast, Biederman relates to a compression switch that receives data and determines a compression level based on the content of the data or congestion level of the network. For example, as shown in Figure 2 of Biederman, a congestion level of an input data stream is estimated, and depending on the estimation, a packet compression selector selects a

compression type. Biederman, however, does not describe or show (see Figure 2) any sort of bypassing circuit. Accordingly, Biederman fails to teach or suggest "a circuit that bypasses keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed" as recited in claim 1.

Kilkki relates to a method for handling network congestion by selecting one of at least two operating modes based on the congestion level in the network. In other words, Kilkki merely describes a congestion handling scheme. Nothing in Kilkki, however, describes bypassing "keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed" as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Biederman and Kilkki, taken individually or combined, fail to describe either implicitly or explicitly "a circuit that bypasses keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Independent claim 8 recites "a circuit that bypasses keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed;" and therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

Independent claims 9, 12, 13, 15-17, 19, 20 and 22 recite "bypassing keyboard signals and mouse signals, supplied via the network to said selected terminal, such that the keyboard and mouse signals are not compressed" and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Dependent claims to 2-4, 10, 11 and 14 inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn.

## **Conclusion**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/626,733

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/28/08

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501